

Serial No. 09/834,229

Remarks

Applicant submits herewith a response and amended claim set that addresses the Examiner's rejections for this case. In this response, Applicant has canceled claims 20 and 26 without prejudice. Applicant further submits a terminal disclaimer to overcome the double patenting rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as containing subject matter not described. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's conclusion, however, in order to further prosecution, Applicant canceled claim 20 and the dependent claim 26 without prejudice to further prosecute these canceled claims in a continuation application. This rejection is now moot.

Double Patenting

The Examiner rejected Claims 13-19, and 22-26 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 -19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,277,819. Applicant encloses a terminal disclaimer herewith to overcome the Examiner's rejection and place the application in condition for allowance.

Serial No. 09/834,229

Summary and Conclusion

Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner's double patenting rejection has been overcome and that the application is now in condition for allowance. If, for any reason, the Examiner feels that a telephone conversation would be helpful in expediting the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is urged to call me.

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory A. Cox
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,504
Phone: 317-277-2620

Eli Lilly and Company
Patent Division/GAC
P.O. Box 6288
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6288

Sept. 22, 2003